APR 1 5 2004

Image AF 1733

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF	:	Zuoxing Yu, et al.
FOR	:	MANUFACTURE OF ABRASION RESISTANT COMPOSITE EXTRUSIONS
SERIAL NO.	:	09/910,337
FILED	:	July 20, 2001
EXAMINER	:	Goff, John L.
ART UNIT	:	1733
CONFIRMATION NO.	:	3639
LAST OFFICE ACTION	:	December 18, 2003
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO .	:	CSAZ 20143

TRANSMITTAL OF APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R.§1.192

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P. O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Applicant transmits herewith three (3) copies of APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R.§1.192 for the above-reference patent application.

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING

I hereby certify that this Transmittal of Appeal Brief Under 37 C.F.R. §1.192 (in triplicate) is being sent by the United States Postal Service as Express Mail procedure and is addressed to Mail Stop – Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. **Express Mail No. EL 998015222 US**

Cathryn Terchek — Date: April 14 2004

Cathryn Terchek

A check in the amount of $ 330.00 is enclosed for filing the Brief. If any additional fees are due, the commissioner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 06-0308.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN,
MINNICH & MCKEE, LLP

Date: April 14, 2004

Joseph E. Waters, Reg. No. 50, 427
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114-2518
216.861.5582

N:\CSAZ\200143\US\CNT0000560V001.doc

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

IN RE APPLICATION OF	:	Zuoxing Yu, et al.
FOR	:	**MANUFACTURE OF ABRASION RESISTANT COMPOSITE EXTRUSIONS**
SERIAL NO.	:	09/910,337
FILED	:	July 20, 2001
EXAMINER	:	Goff, John L.
ART UNIT	:	1733
CONFIRMATION NO.	:	3639
LAST OFFICE ACTION	:	December 18, 2003
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO .	:	CSAZ 20143

APPEAL BRIEF UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.192

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This Appeal Brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal that was received by the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office on March 23, 2004.

The fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.17 and any required petition for extension of time for filing this brief and fees therefor, are dealt with in the accompanying Transmittal of Appeal Brief.

Appellant files herewith an Appeal Brief in connection with the above-identified application wherein claims 1-6, 8-20, 22, 23, and 25-30 were finally rejected in the Final Office Action of September 24, 2003. What follows is Appellants' Appeal Brief (in triplicate) in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.192(a).

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING

I hereby certify that this Appeal Brief Under 37 C.F.R. §1.192 is being sent by the United States Postal Service as Express Mail procedure and is addressed to Mail Stop – Appeal Brief - Patents, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. **Express Mail No.** EV 998015222 US

Cathryn Terchek

Date: April 14 2004

04/16/2004 CNGUYEN 00000008 09910337

01 FC:1402 330.00 OP

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(1))

The real parties in interest in this appeal are the inventors named in the caption of this brief (Zuoxing Yu, Tim Pauli, John Seward, and Ted Ebel) and their assignee, Cooper Standard Automotive, Inc.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(2))

Currently, it is believed that there are no other appeals or interferences in process or pending before the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office which the present application bases its priority from, or any cases which base their priority upon the present application, that will directly affect, or will be directly affected by, or will have a bearing on the Board's decision in this appeal.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(3))

The status of the claims set forth after the Advisory Action mailed December 18, 2003 was, and is, as follows:

Allowed: none

Rejected Claims: 1-6, 8-20, 22, 23, and 25-30

The present appeal is directed specifically to claims 1-6, 8-20, 22, 23, and 25-30.

IV. STATUS OF THE AMENDMENT (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(4))

No amendments have been made that have not been entered by the Examiner.

The final rejection made in the Office Action of September 24, 2003 was maintained in an Advisory Action mailed December 18, 2003.

V. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(5))

The present invention is directed to a method for forming a composite extrusion for use as a glass run channel in automobiles. In one embodiment, the method includes the steps of providing a thermoset elastomer rubber, extruding the rubber to form a main body member, providing a crosslinkable thermoplastic consisting essentially of polyolefin, extruding the thermoplastic to form an abrasion resistance layer, at least partially crosslinking the thermoplastic, contacting the abrasion resistant layer with the main body member, and, subsequent to this step, at least partially curing the main body member (claim 1). The crosslinkable

thermoplastic may be a moisture crosslinkable thermoplastic, more particularly a silane grafted polyethylene (claims 2-3). The extrusion and crosslinking steps for the rubber and thermoplastic may be conducted at various preferred temperatures (claims 5-6). The contacting of the abrasion resistant layer with the main body may be conducted before the thermoplastic is crosslinked (claim 8). The materials may be extruded simultaneously (claim 9). The abrasion resistant layer may be a tape member that is bonded to the main body with a lamination wheel (claims 10-11). The rubber may be an EPDM rubber (claim 12). The thickness of the abrasion resistant layer may range from 0.005 to 0.040 inches.

In a second embodiment, the method includes the steps of providing a thermoset elastomer rubber, extruding the rubber to form a main body member, providing a crosslinkable thermoplastic, extruding the thermoplastic at a temperature of from about 200 degrees C to 220 degrees C to form an abrasion resistance layer, contacting the abrasion resistant layer with the main body member, at least partially crosslinking the thermoplastic, and, at least partially curing the main body member (claim 15). The above limitations mentioned in connection with the first embodiment also apply to the second embodiment (claims 16-20, 22-23, 25-30).

VI. ISSUES (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(6))

Whether claims 1-6 and 8-14 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement and 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Whether claims 1, 2, 5-6, 8-9, 12-16, 19-20, 22-23, 25, and 28-30 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,183,613 to Edwards ("Edwards") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,415,822 to Cook ("Cook").

Whether claims 3, 4, 17, and 18 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Edwards and Cook in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,646,155 to Scott ("Scott").

Whether claims 10, 11, 26, and 27 are unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Edwards and Cook in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,099,67 to Hayashi ("Hayashi")

VII. GROUPING OF THE CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(7))

Not all of the claims at issue, i.e., claims 1-6, 8-20, 22, 23, and 25-30

stand or fall together. That is, at least the following claim groups recite separately patentable subject matter: claim 1; claims 3 and 17; claims 8 and 22; claims 9 and 23; 10, 11, 26 and 27; and claims 13, 14, 29 and 30. This is explained in detail below.

Claim 1, from which the remainder of the rejected claims 2-6 and 8-14 depend, recites a method for forming a composite extrusion including the steps of providing a thermoset elastomer rubber, extruding the rubber to form a main body member, providing a crosslinkable thermoplastic consisting essentially of polyolefin, extruding the thermoplastic to form an abrasion resistance layer, at least partially crosslinking the thermoplastic, contacting the abrasion resistant layer with the main body member, and, subsequent to this step, at least partially curing the main body member. Claim 15 is substantially similar except that the crosslinkable thermoplastic is not limited to consisting essentially of polyolefin. Claim 1 is thus separately patentable from claim 15, because the cited art does not disclose a thermoplastic consisting essentially of polyolefin, as discussed more fully below.

Dependent claims 3 and 17 recite wherein the moisture crosslinkable polyolefin is a silane grafted polyethylene. Even if it is deemed by the Board that the Examiner is correct in his rejection of claims 1 and 15, claims 3 and 17 recite a specific crosslinkable thermoplastic that is not disclosed or suggested by the cited art. By reciting this material, claims 3 and 17 are separately patentable independent of whether the broader claim or claims from which they depend are patentable. With respect to claims 8 and 22, these claims recite a specific order for the steps which is not disclosed or suggested in the art. Thus, even if it is determined that the prior art discloses or suggests all of the steps in the broader claims, the specific order of these steps not taught or suggested by the cited art renders these claims patentable. A similar argument applies to claims 9 and 22, which recite a simultaneous occurrence of two of the steps in the broader claims. With respect to claims 10, 11, 26 and 27, these claims are also separately patentable based on the fact that they are directed to distinct embodiments (i.e. the use of a tape member and lamination step) that are only taught by a reference which is not properly combinable with the other cited references. Finally, with respect to claims 13, 14, 29 and 30, these claims recite thicknesses for the abrasion resistant layer that are not disclosed or suggested by the cited art, as acknowledged by the Examiner.

VIII. ARGUMENTS (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(8))

A. The Examiner's Rejection of Claims 1-6 and 8-14 as Being Indefinite and Failing to Comply with the Written Description Requirement is Erroneous and Must Be Reversed.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-6 and 8-14 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, for failing to comply with the written description requirement and 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Appellants respectfully traverse.

The Examiner first presented this rejection after the appellants amended claim 1 to recite that the crosslinkable thermoplastic consisted essentially of polyolefin. The Examiner argued that this amendment constituted new matter. In the advisory action mailed December 18, 2003, the Examiner stated:

> it is noted that while the phrase 'consisting essentially of' is an accepted term the specification does not disclose anything other than the crosslinkable thermoplastic comprises [sic] polyolefin. Specifically, the specification does not disclose additional materials that that could be used in the crosslinkable thermoplastic that do not materially affect the basic characteristics of the thermoplastic such that the use of the phrase 'consisting essentially of' is new matter and renders the claims indefinite.

Appellants are somewhat at a loss as to how to respond to this rejection, as it presents, at least to the undersigned's knowledge, a completely novel rejection that finds no basis in law or logic. As far as the appellants can determine, and based on the above quotation, the Examiner's rejection is essentially based on the fact that the specification fails to disclose additional materials that can be included in the thermoplastic that DO NOT materially affect the characteristics of the thermoplastic.

What type of recitation in the specification would the Examiner have required to allow such an amendment? A patent specification is not an exhaustive technical manual on a subject. Rather, it is intended to teach someone skilled in the art how to practice the invention. In the present case, appellants are not required to list every material that could possibly be included in the crosslinkable thermoplastic, including those materials that DO NOT affect its material characteristics. An almost limitless number of contaminants and additives may be included in the present crosslinkable thermoplastic. Appellants are not required to list all of these to be entitled to use the claim language "consisting essentially of...".

Further, appellants submit that it is this very fact, i.e. that the specification only discloses polyolefin as the material for use in the crosslinkable thermoplastic, that permits the contested amendment. That is, because the specification doesn't disclose additional required materials in the crosslinkable thermoplastic that affect its basic characteristics, the use of the phrase "consisting essentially of" is appropriate.

Although the specification does not recite additional materials for use in the crosslinkable thermoplastic, it also does not preclude the possibility of additional materials. It is perfectly within the appellants' rights to narrow the present claims to recite an abrasion resistant layer to a crosslinked thermoplastic consisting essentially of a polyolefin.

To highlight the inconsistency of the Examiner's opinion, appellants would like to draw the Board's attention to the Examiner position in the final office action and the advisory action. In the final office action and in support of the present rejection, the Examiner stated, "[I]t is unclear where in the specification the crosslinkable thermoplastic is described as 'consisting essentially of polyolefin'. It is noted the specification does disclose the crosslinkable thermoplastic as 'comprising a polyolefin'." Based on this statement, it would follow that the Examiner would have had no problem if the amendment read "comprising polyolefin". Similarly, in the quotation from the advisory action cited above, the Examiner notes that no additional materials besides polyolefin are disclosed. Based on this, the Examiner would also apparently have had no problem if the amendment had been made to read "consisting of polyolefin." Based on this, the Examiner's rejection of the phrase "consisting essentially of", which is of intermediate scope between the broad "comprising" and the relatively narrow "consisting of" language, is illogical. How can both a broader and narrower scope be acceptable while an intermediate scope is not? This only highlights the inconsistency of the Examiner's position.

B. The Examiner's Rejection of Claims 1, 2, 5-6, 8-9, 12-16, 19-20, 22-23, 25, and 28-30 as obvious over Edwards in view of Cook Is Erroneous and Must Be Reversed

The Examiner further rejected claims 1, 2, 5-6, 8-9, 12-16, 19-20, 22-23, 25, and 28-30 as unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Edwards in view of Cook. Appellants respectfully traverse.

Edwards is directed to a process for forming a glass run channel for use in automotive applications comprising the steps of contacting a melted polyolefin compound with an uncured elastomeric substrate and subsequently curing the elastomeric substrate to adhere the polyolefin compound to the elastomeric substrate. Edwards specifically teaches curing the elastomeric substrate after contacting it with the melted polyolefin compound (col. 5, lines 52-60, claim 1). Optional additives that may be added to the polyolefin include softening agents such as cured elastomers or thermoplastic elastomers, such as Santoprene® (col. 9, lines 47 to col. 10, lines 25).

Cook, on the other hand, is directed to the method of forming a composite extrusion wherein a main body portion is extruded from a thermosetting material, the main body portion is then cured and passed through a second extruder where a thermoplastic is extruded onto one or more surfaces of the main body portion. The thermoplastic material may be polyethylene, polypropylene or ethylene vinyl acetate. These materials can be modified with EPDM, butyl compounds, or other elastomers that may be cross-linked (col. 4, lines 29-34). As opposed to Edwards, the method of Cook teaches that the elastomer rubber is cured prior to its mating with the thermoplastic material. The proposed combination of Edwards and Cook fails to render the present claims obvious for at least the following reasons.

First, there is no motivation to combine the two references. To properly combine references under 35 U.S.C. §103, there must be some suggestion or motivation to modify or combine reference teachings (MPEP §2143.01). Here there is no motivation to combine the teachings of Cook and Edwards. In this respect, the Examiner states, "[O]ne of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have readily appreciated using as the polyolefin taught by Edwards a crosslinkable polyolefin, i.e. a polyolefin crosslinked by means such as moisture, as it was well known in the art to use a crosslinkable polyolefin as the abrasion resistant layer as shown for example by Cook." Even assuming for the purposes of argument that this statement is true, it fails to provide proper motivation for combining the references. That is, even assuming that one skilled in the art would have appreciated that a crosslinkable polyolefin could have been used in the invention of Edwards, the absence of any motivation to do so precludes the finding of obviousness.

In this respect, the mere fact that a prior art device could be modified so as to produce the claimed invention is not a basis for an obviousness rejection unless the prior art suggested the desirability of such a modification. *In re Gordon*, 221 USPQ 1125 (Fed. Cir. 1984) (the combination of the references taught every element of the claimed invention. However, without a motivation to combine a rejection based on a *prima facie* case of obviousness is improper.) Here, the Examiner has not provided any reasons why one skilled in the art would be motivated to combine the teachings of Cook and Edwards. At most he has provided an argument that one skilled in the art recognized that such a combination is possible. A recognition that something can be done is distinct from a motivation to do it. Absent such a suggestion or motivation, the Examiner's combining of the two references is a classic example of impermissible hindsight reconstruction. *Texas Instruments, Inc. v. U.S. Int'l Trade Comm'n*, 26 USPQ2d 1018 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Conclusory statements on the propriety of combining the teachings of prior art references, such as those provided by the Examiner in this case, are insufficient to sustain an obviousness rejection. *In re Lee*, 61 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002).

Appellants submit that, despite the Examiner's arguments, one skilled in the art would not have readily appreciated using a crosslinkable polyolefin as the polyolefin taught by Edwards. In support of his position, Examiner states "it is noted Edwards is directed to using general polyolefins known to one in the art such that one of ordinary skill in the art would look to the broad filed of polyolefin materials including those that are crosslinked or uncrosslinked." (Advisory Action, pg. 2).

Appellants submit that this is a mischaracterization of the materials and that such a substitution is not as straightforward as the Examiner would have it seem. In this respect, appellants take issue with the Examiner's contention that because Edwards does not explicitly disclose that the polyolefins used therein are uncrosslinked, that a crosslinked polyolefin is contemplated and could thus be used. The Board will appreciate that due to absence of unsaturation, conventional polyolefins are not crosslinked. That is, polyolefins require specialized crosslinking techniques due to this absence of double bonds in the polymer backbone. To one skilled in the art, the use of the term "polyolefin" without any additional recitation would denote a conventional, i.e. uncrosslinked, polyolefin. A positive recitation of crosslinking is required to denote a specialized crosslinkable polyolefin. It is improper and misleading for the Examiner to thus contend that

Edwards supports the use of crosslinked polyolefins without any positive recitation of this. Further, the appellants note that Edwards repeatedly refers to the polyolefin as a thermoplastic throughout the patent. A crosslinked polyolefin would take on at least some characteristics of a thermoset. Failure of Edwards to note this is further evidence that only an uncrosslinked polyolefin is contemplated as the abrasion resistant layer therein.

In addition, Cook relates to a method of forming a composite extrusion in which an elastomer rubber main body member is cured prior to mating with a thermoplastic layer, while Edwards specifically teaches curing the elastomeric substrate after contacting it with the melted polyolefin compound (col. 5, lines 52-60, claim 1). These two references are drawn to different processes to making composite extrusions. One skilled in the art practicing the invention of Edwards would not be motivated to use the teachings disclosed in Cook since Cook relates to a different process, and there is no indication that these teachings would be suitable for use therein. If the proposed modification or combination of the prior art would change the principle of operation of the prior art invention being modified, then the teachings of the references are not sufficient to render the claims prima facie obvious. *In re Ratti*, 123 USPQ 349 (CCPA 1959). Here, that is exactly what the Examiner is proposing – changing the principle of operation of the references in an attempt to meet the recitations of the present claims.

Furthermore, and with respect to claims 8 and 22, even assuming the propriety of the proposed combination, such a combination fails to disclose or suggest contacting the elastomer rubber with the crosslinkable thermoplastic before the step of at least partially crosslinking the thermoplastic. In support of his rejection, the Examiner states:

> it is noted Edwards co-extrudes the abrasion resistant layer with the main body member with no intervening steps prior to contacting such that the combination of Edwards in view of Cook would create a process wherein the abrasion resistant layer is crosslinked/cured after contacting the main body member as the crosslinkable abrasion resistant layer is crosslinked/cured only after being in a melt state and the abrasion resistant layer and main body member are contacted directly after co-extrusion with no intervening steps.

This is a misleading characterization of the teachings of Edwards and Cook. Edwards teaches contacting of the layers directly after co-extrusion because

Edwards does not disclose any crosslinking step for the abrasion resistant layer because it does not contemplate the use of a crosslinkable abrasion resistant layer. For the Examiner to thus simply conclude that a crosslinking step, if present, would of course be subsequent to the contacting step is disingenuous. There is absolutely no support for this assertion in either Edwards or Cook. Nowhere does Edwards or Cook require that the layers be contacted immediately after extrusion with no intervening steps. Neither reference discloses a step of crosslinking the abrasion resistant layer. The Examiner has no support for his position that, assuming the presence of such a crosslinking step, it could not feasibly take place after extrusion and before contact of the two layers.

C. The Examiner's Rejection of Claims 3, 4, 17 and 18 as Being Obvious Over Edwards in View of Cook and Scott Is Erroneous and Must Be Reversed

The Examiner rejected claims 3, 4, 17 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards and Cook in view of Scott. Appellants respectfully traverse.

The disclosures of Edwards and Cook are outlined above. Scott is directed to a method of crosslinking a polyolefin by grafting silane groups onto the polyolefin backbone and subsequently exposing the product to moisture. Appellants submit that the proposed combination fails to render the present claims unpatentable for at least the following reasons.

There is no motivation to combine the references. To properly combine references under 35 U.S.C. §103 there must be some suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of these separate references. In this respect, the lack of motivation for combining Edwards and Cook is outlined above. Further, there is no motivation to combine Scott with either Edwards or Cook. In support of his position, the Examiner states "one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would have readily appreciated using as the moisture crosslinkable polyolefin taught by Edwards as modified by Cook a silane grafted polyolefin crosslinked in a steam bath as suggested by Scott et al. to enable crosslinking of the polyolefin under less critical crosslinking conditions that those which are normally present in the conventional crosslinking techniques." What "critical crosslinking conditions" is the Examiner referring too? Appellants submit that

crosslinking using silane grafting techniques are at least as "critical" as other crosslinking techniques. Appellants submit that the presence of a steam bath and the requirement of the silane graft present at least as critical conditions as other techniques. Thus, Appellants submit that the proposed combination of Edwards and Cook, in view of Scott, fails to render the present claims unpatentable. Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

D. *The Examiner's Rejection of Claims 10, 11, 26 and 27 as Being Obvious Over Edwards in View of Cook and Hayashi Is Erroneous and Must Be Reversed*

The Examiner rejected claims 10, 11, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Edwards and Cook and further in view of Hayashi. Appellants respectfully traverse.

The disclosures of Edwards and Cook are detailed above. Hayashi is directed to a method of making a glass run channel including the steps of bonding a tape member to an extruded rubber member. The tape member comprises polyethylene, polypropylene or a thermoplastic elastomer.

Despite the Examiner's arguments, there is no motivation to combine Edwards, Cook and Hayashi. The reasons why Edwards and Cook cannot be combined are detailed above. It is improper to combine Hayashi with either Edwards or Cook since the references disclose and teach completely different subject matter. That is, Edwards and Cook both teach the coextrusion of a thermoplastic onto a rubber member. Hayashi, on the other hand, discloses the lamination of a tape member onto a rubber main body member. There is no indication that the methods disclosed in either Edwards or Cook could properly use a tape member as the abrasion resistant layer. This is particularly true with several of the embodiments described in Cook (such as those in Figure 2c), which would require multiple tape members to cover the varied surfaces of the composite extrusion. This is also the case with many of the embodiments disclosed in Edwards, which require multiple surfaces to be coated and would thus require multiple tape members, rollers, etc. as required by the method of Hayashi. The Examiner has provided absolutely no evidence that the teachings of Hayashi could be combined with Cook and/or Edwards. In fact, the references actually teach away from the use of a tape member. In this respect, Edwards specifically discloses that the polyolefin layer is

substantially melted when it is contacted with the elastomeric substrate. Hayashi, on the other hand, discloses a solid tape member that only begins to melt when contacted with the hot based rubber member.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above, Appellant respectfully submits that claims 1-9, 11-18, and 20-21 are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited art.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner's rejections be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY, SHARPE, FAGAN
MINNICH & McKEE, LLP

Dated: April 14, 2004

Joseph E. Waters, Reg. No. 50,427
1100 Superior Ave., 7th Floor
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 861-5582

L:\JEW\DATA\CSA\20143\appeal brief.doc

IX. APPENDIX OF CLAIMS (37 C.F.R. §1.192(c)(9))

1. A method for forming a composite extrusion suitable for use as a glass run channel in an automobile, the method comprising the steps of:

providing a thermoset elastomer rubber;

extruding said thermoset elastomer rubber to form a main body member;

providing a crosslinkable thermoplastic consisting essentially of polyolefin;

extruding said crosslinkable thermoplastic to form an abrasion resistant layer;

at least partially crosslinking said crosslinkable thermoplastic of said abrasion resistant layer;

contacting said abrasion resistant layer with said main body member; and

subsequent to contacting said abrasion resistant layer with said main body member, at least partially curing said main body member by heating said main body member to the cure temperature of said thermoset elastomer rubber, thereby forming said composite extrusion.

2. The method according to claim 1, wherein said crosslinkable thermoplastic is a moisture crosslinkable polyolefin.

3. The method according to claim 2, wherein said moisture crosslinkable polyolefin is a silane grafted polyethylene.

4. The method according to claim 2, wherein the step of at least partially crosslinking said moisture crosslinkable polyolefin is performed by immersing said abrasion resistant layer in a steam bath.

5. The method according to claim 4, wherein the step of extruding said thermoset elastomer rubber is performed utilizing an extrusion temperature of about 110°C, the step of extruding said crosslinkable thermoplastic is performed utilizing an extrusion temperature of from about 200°C to about 220°C, the step of immersing said abrasion resistant layer in a steam bath is performed by utilizing said steam bath at a temperature of from about 100°C to about 110°C and the step of at least partially curing said main body member by heating said main body member is performed by heating said body member to a temperature of from about 195°C to about 300°C.

6. The method according to claim 5, wherein the step of at least partially curing said main body member by heating said main body member is performed by heating said main body member to a temperature of about 195°C, maintaining said main body member at about 195°C for about 15 to about 50 seconds, further heating said main body member to a temperature of about 220°C, maintaining said main body member at about 220°C for about 45 seconds to about 2.4 minutes, and then cooling said main body member to a temperature of about 195°C and maintaining said main body member at about 195°C for about 15 to about 50 seconds.

7. (withdrawn)

8. The method according to claim 1, wherein said contacting step is performed before said step of at least partially crosslinking said crosslinkable thermoplastic of said abrasion resistant layer.

9. The method according to claim 1, wherein the steps of extruding said thermoset elastomer rubber and extruding said crosslinkable thermoplastic are performed by simultaneously extruding said thermoset elastomer rubber and said crosslinkable thermoplastic through a common extrusion die.

10. The method according to claim 1, wherein said abrasion resistant layer is a tape member.

11. The method according to claim 10, further comprising a lamination step wherein said tape member is laminated to said main body member by use of a lamination wheel.

12. The method according to claim 1, wherein the step of providing a thermoset elastomer rubber is performed by providing an ethylene-propylene-diene terpolymer (EPDM) rubber.

13. The method according to claim 1, wherein the thickness of said abrasion resistant layer is from about 0.005 to about 0.040 inches.

14. The method according to claim 13, wherein the thickness of said abrasion resistant layer is from about 0.010 to about 0.020 inches.

15. A method for forming a composite extrusion suitable for use as a glass run channel in an automobile, the method comprising the steps of:

providing a thermoset elastomer rubber;

extruding a main body member from said thermoset elastomer rubber;

providing a crosslinkable thermoplastic;

extruding an abrasion resistant layer from said crosslinkable thermoplastic at a temperature of from about 200°C to about 220°C;

contacting said abrasion resistant layer with said main body member;

at least partially crosslinking said crosslinkable thermoplastic of said abrasion resistant layer; and

at least partially curing said main body member by heating said main body member to the cure temperature of said thermoset elastomer rubber, thereby forming the composite extrusion.

16. The method according to claim 15, wherein said crosslinkable thermoplastic is a moisture crosslinkable polyolefin.

17. The method according to claim 16, wherein said moisture crosslinkable polyolefin is a silane grafted polyethylene.

18. The method according to claim 16, wherein the step of at least partially crosslinking said crosslinkable thermoplastic of said abrasion resistant layer is performed by immersing said abrasion resistant layer in a steam bath.

19. The method according to claim 18, wherein the step of extruding said main body member is performed at an extrusion temperature of about 110°C, the step of immersing said abrasion resistant layer in a steam bath is performed at a steam bath temperature of from about 100°C to about 110°C and the step of at least partially curing said main body member by heating said main body member is performed by heating the main body member to a temperature of from about 195°C

to about 300°C.

20. The method according to claim 19, wherein the step of at least partially curing said main body member by heating said main body member is performed by heating said main body member to a temperature of about 195°C, maintaining said main body member at about 195°C for about 15 to about 50 seconds, further heating said main body member to a temperature of about 220°C, maintaining said main body member at about 220°C for about 45 seconds to about 2.4 minutes, and then cooling said main body member to a temperature of about 195°C and maintaining said main body member at about 195°C for about 15 to about 50 seconds.

21. (withdrawn)

22. The method according to claim 15, wherein the contacting step is performed before the step of at least partially crosslinking said thermoplastic of said abrasion resistant layer.

23. The method according to claim 15, wherein the steps of extruding said thermoset elastomer rubber and said crosslinkable thermoplastic are performed by simultaneously extruding said thermoset elastomer rubber and said crosslinkable thermoplastic through a common extrusion die.

24. (withdrawn)

25. The method according to claim 15, wherein said main body member is cured subsequent to contacting said abrasion resistant layer with said main body member.

26. The method according to claim 15, wherein said abrasion resistant layer is a tape member.

27. The method according to claim 26, further comprising a lamination step wherein said tape member is laminated to said main body member by use of a lamination wheel.

28. The method according to claim 15, wherein said thermoset elastomer rubber is an ethylene-propylene-diene terpolymer (EPDM) rubber.

29. The method according to claim 15, wherein the thickness of said abrasion resistant layer is from about 0.005 to about 0.040 inches.

30. The method according to claim 29, wherein the thickness of the abrasion resistant layer is from about 0.010 to about 0.020 inches.